

TO: Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK
--	---

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Colorado on the following Patents

DOCKET NO. 11-cv-00618	DATE FILED 3/11/11	U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
PLAINTIFF SelfLink, LLC		DEFENDANT Textron Systems Corporation et al.
PATENT OR	DATE OF PATENT	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 7,301,455		Please see copy of Complaint attached hereto
2 7,504,937		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading	
PATENT OR	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT

CLERK GREGORY C. LANGHAM	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE
------------------------------------	-------------------	------

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to
 Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 4—Case file copy

but are not limited to, Defendant ADT's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its ADT Pulse Integrated Security Network products.

39. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant ADT's infringing conduct. Defendant ADT is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant ADT's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

40. Defendant ADT is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '937 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '937 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '937 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '937 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant ADT's products.

41. Upon information and belief, Tyco International Ltd., parent company of Defendant ADT has been aware of the existence of the '937 Patent since at least October of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (including a copy of U.S. Patent App. No. 11/872,005, which issued as the '937 Patent), to executives of Tyco International Ltd. with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least October 2008, Defendant ADT's infringement has therefore been willful.

42. Defendant UTC has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '937 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include,

but are not limited to, Defendant UTC's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its Kidde Wireless Smoke Alarm products.

43. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant UTC's infringing conduct. Defendant UTC is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant UTC's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

44. Defendant UTC is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '937 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '937 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '937 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '937 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant UTC's products.

45. Upon information and belief, Defendant UTC has been aware of the existence of the '937 Patent since at least October of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (including a copy of U.S. Patent App. No. 11/872,005, which issued as the '937 Patent), to Defendant UTC executives with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least October 2008, Defendant UTC's infringement has therefore been willful.

46. Defendant Fluke has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '937 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant Fluke's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its Comark Wireless Monitoring System products.

47. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant Fluke's infringing conduct. Defendant Fluke is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant Fluke's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

48. Defendant Fluke is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '937 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '937 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '937 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '937 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant Fluke's products.

49. Upon information and belief, Defendant Fluke has been aware of the existence of the '937 Patent since at least September of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (including a copy of U.S. Patent App. No. 11/872,005, which issued as the '937 Patent), to Mr. Kal Mukherjee of Defendant Fluke with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least September 2008, Defendant Fluke's infringement has therefore been willful.

50. Defendant BRK has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '937 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant BRK's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its First Alert OneLink System products.

51. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant BRK's infringing conduct. Defendant BRK is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately

compensates it for Defendant BRK's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

52. Defendant BRK is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '937 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '937 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '937 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '937 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant BRK's products.

53. Upon information and belief, Defendant BRK has been aware of the existence of the '937 Patent since at least September of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (including a copy of U.S. Patent App. No. 11/872,005, which issued as the '937 Patent), to executives of Defendant BRK with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least September 2008, Defendant BRK's infringement has therefore been willful.

IV. JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff SelfLink hereby requests a trial by jury pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff SelfLink requests that the Court find in its favor and against Defendants, and that the Court grant Plaintiff SelfLink the following relief:

- a. Judgment that one or more claims of the '455 Patent and the '937 Patent have been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by one or more Defendants and/or by others to whose infringement Defendants have contributed and/or by others whose infringement has been induced by Defendants;

- b. Judgment that Defendants ADT, UTC, Fluke, and BRK have willfully infringed the '455 Patent and the '937 Patent;
- c. Judgment that Defendants account for and pay to Plaintiff SelfLink, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285, all damages to and costs incurred by Plaintiff SelfLink because of Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein, including three-times any such damages because of Defendant ADT's, Defendant UTC's, Defendant Fluke's and Defendant BRK's willful infringement;
- d. That Plaintiff SelfLink be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages caused by Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- e. That this Court declare this an exceptional case and award Plaintiff SelfLink its reasonable attorney's fees and costs in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
- f. That Plaintiff SelfLink be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: March 11th, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

FISCHER LAW FIRM, P.C.

/s/ Ronnie Fischer

Ronnie Fischer, # 35260

Fischer Law Firm, P.C.

1777 South Harrison Street

Penthouse – Suite 1500

Denver, Colorado 80210

Telephone: (303) 756-2500

Fax: (303) 756-2506

E-mail: Ronnie@FischerEsq.com

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF
SELFLINK, LLC

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. _____

SELFLINK, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company,

Plaintiff,

v.

TEXTRON SYSTEMS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation;
ADT SECURITY SERVICES, INC., a Delaware Corporation;
UTC FIRE & SECURITY CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation;
FLUKE ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation; and
BRK BRANDS, INC. d/b/a FIRST ALERT, INC., a Delaware Corporation;

Defendants.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff SelfLink, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company, by and through its attorneys at law, the Fischer Law Firm, P.C., states and avers as follows:

I. THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff SelfLink, LLC (hereinafter "Plaintiff SelfLink") is a Limited Liability Company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Colorado, having a principal place of business located at 2116 Vermont Road, Vail, Colorado 81657.

2. Defendant Textron Systems Corporation (hereinafter "Defendant Textron") is a Corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 40 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903.

3. Defendant ADT Security Services, Inc. (hereinafter "Defendant ADT") is a Limited Liability Company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at One Town Center Road, Boca Raton, Florida 33486.

4. Defendant UTC Fire & Security Corporation (hereinafter “Defendant UTC”) is a Corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 1 Financial Plaza, Hartford, Connecticut 06101.

5. Defendant Fluke Electronics Corporation (hereinafter “Defendant Fluke”) is a Corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 6920 Seaway Boulevard, Everett, Washington 98203.

6. Defendant BRK Brands, Inc. (hereinafter “Defendant BRK”) *d/b/a* First Alert, Inc. (hereinafter “First Alert”) is a Corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 3901 Liberty Street Road, Aurora, Illinois 60504.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This is an action for infringement of United States patents arising under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284-285, among others. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of the action under Title 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1338(a).

8. The Court has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant, and venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). Each Defendant has substantial contacts with the forum as a result of pervasive business activities conducted within the State of Colorado and within this District, including but not limited to: (i) the marketing, sale and distribution of infringing alarm and monitoring systems; and (ii) the marketing and sale of services for alarm and monitoring systems.

9. Each Defendant has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement, directly and/or through agents and intermediaries, by making, using, selling, offering for sale and/or leasing certain infringing products, services, and systems in Colorado.

Specifically, each Defendant sells (directly and/or through intermediaries) infringing alarm and/or monitoring systems in this District.

III. PATENT INFRINGEMENT

10. On or about November 27, 2007, United States Patent No. 7,301,455 (the “’455 Patent”) was duly and legally issued for a “Self-Configuring Emergency Event Alarm Network.” A true and correct copy of the ’455 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

11. On or about March 17, 2009, United States Patent No. 7,504,937 (the “’937 Patent”) was duly and legally issued for a “Self-Configuring Emergency Event Alarm Network.” A true and correct copy of the ’937 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

12. By virtue of assignment, Plaintiff SelfLink owns all rights, title, and interest in and to the ’455 and ’937 Patents and possesses all rights of recovery under them, including the right to prosecute this action and to collect damages for all relevant times.

13. As it pertains to this lawsuit, the ’455 and ’937 Patents are infringed by Defendants’ use, sale, and provision of alarm and/or monitoring systems as detailed herein.

COUNT I – INFRINGEMENT OF THE ’455 PATENT

14. Plaintiff SelfLink incorporates each of the allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

15. Defendant Textron has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the ’455 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink’s consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant Textron’s use, sale, provision, and operation of its VantagePoint Wireless Sensor Network products.

16. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant Textron’s infringing conduct. Defendant Textron is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately

compensates it for Defendant Textron's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

17. Defendant Textron is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '455 Patent by providing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '455 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '455 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '455 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant Textron's products.

18. Defendant ADT has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '455 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant ADT's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its ADT Pulse Integrated Security Network products.

19. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant ADT's infringing conduct. Defendant ADT is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant ADT's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

20. Defendant ADT is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '455 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '455 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '455 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have

no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '455 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant ADT's products.

21. Upon information and belief, Tyco International Ltd., parent company of Defendant ADT has been aware of the existence of the '455 Patent since at least October of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (which included a copy of the '455 Patent), to executives of Tyco International Ltd. with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least October 2008, Defendant ADT's infringement has therefore been willful.

22. Defendant UTC has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '455 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant UTC's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its Kidde Wireless Smoke Alarm products.

23. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant UTC's infringing conduct. Defendant UTC is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant UTC's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

24. Defendant UTC is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '455 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '455 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '455 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '455 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant UTC's products.

25. Upon information and belief, Defendant UTC has been aware of the existence of the '455 Patent since at least October of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (which included a copy of the '455 Patent), to Defendant UTC executives with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least October 2008, Defendant UTC's infringement has therefore been willful.

26. Defendant Fluke has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '455 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant Fluke's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its Comark Wireless Monitoring System products.

27. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant Fluke's infringing conduct. Defendant Fluke is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant Fluke's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

28. Defendant Fluke is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '455 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '455 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '455 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '455 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant Fluke's products.

29. Upon information and belief, Defendant Fluke has been aware of the existence of the '455 Patent since at least September of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (which included a

copy of the '455 Patent), to Mr. Kal Mukherjee of Defendant Fluke with an offer to engage in licensing negotiations. Since at least September 2008, Defendant Fluke's infringement has therefore been willful.

30. Defendant BRK has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '455 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant BRK's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its First Alert OneLink System products.

31. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant BRK's infringing conduct. Defendant BRK is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant BRK's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

32. Defendant BRK is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '455 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '455 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '455 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '455 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant BRK's products.

33. Upon information and belief, Defendant BRK has been aware of the existence of the '455 Patent since at least September of 2008, when representatives of Duff & Phelps, on behalf of Plaintiff SelfLink, provided notice in the form of correspondence (which included a copy of the '455 Patent), to executives of Defendant BRK with an offer to engage in licensing

negotiations. Since at least September 2008, Defendant BRK's infringement has therefore been willful.

COUNT II – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '937 PATENT

34. Plaintiff SelfLink incorporates each of the allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

35. Defendant Textron has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '937 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include, but are not limited to, Defendant Textron's use, sale, provision, and operation of at least its VantagePoint Wireless System products.

36. Plaintiff SelfLink has been damaged as a result of Defendant Textron's infringing conduct. Defendant Textron is liable to Plaintiff SelfLink in an amount that adequately compensates it for Defendant Textron's infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

37. Defendant Textron is further responsible for the indirect infringement of the '937 Patent by providing infringing products to customers, with full knowledge of the '937 Patent and the infringement of its respective products, and (a) inducing infringement by instructing its respective customers to use the provided products in an infringing manner, and (b) contributing to the infringement of the '937 Patent by providing the infringing products – products that have no substantial non-infringing use – to its respective customers who then infringe the '937 Patent through their infringing use of Defendant Textron's products.

38. Defendant ADT has infringed and is continuing to directly infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of, at least Claims 1 and 40 of the '937 Patent without Plaintiff SelfLink's consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include,